REMARKS

Claims 1 - 4 and 7 - 10 are pending in this application. Claims 1 - 3 and 7 - 9 stand withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention.

The rejection of claims 4 - 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph was withdrawn in response to the Amendment filed April 14, 2006.

Claim 4 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirchengast et al. in view of Srivatsa et al. on the grounds that it would have been obvious to combine the endothelin blockers taught by Kirchengast et al. with the selective $\alpha_{\nu}\beta_{3}$ integrin antagonist taught by Srivatsa et al. The Office Action states that coadministration of an endothelin blocker and $\alpha_{\nu}\beta_{3}$ integrin antagonist "is expected to provide efficacy at lower doses than the doses used individually, with a reduction in side effects".

This rejection is respectfully traversed because the specifically claimed combination is not taught and it leads to a surprising effect. More specifically, the present invention permits the use of each component at a dose less than the dose useful alone, with a reduction in side effects (page 4, lines 23-27 and page 20, lines 24-30). Furthermore there is no prior art cited and applied to support the proposition relied upon that coadministration of an endothelin blocker and $\alpha_{\nu}\beta_{3}$ integrin antagonist is expected to provide efficacy at lower doses than the doses used individually, with a reduction in side effects.

Claim 10 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirchengast et al. in view of Srivatsa et al. and U.S. Patent 4,761,406. This rejection in respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth above.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 4 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin L. Katz Reg. No. 25,011

Wood, Phillips, Katz, Clark & Mortimer 500 West Madison Street, Suite 3800 Chicago, Illinois 60661 (312) 876-1800

Date: May 11, 2006